



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/012,259	02/26/2002	Takashi Sato	4034-8	3640

7590 05/23/2003
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.
8th Floor
1100 North Glebe Rd.
Arlington, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

DI GRAZIO, JEANNE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,259

Applicant(s)

SATO ET AL.

Examiner

Jeanne A. Di Grazio

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Priority to Japanese Patent Application No. 2001-051398 (Feb. 27, 2001) is claimed.

Drawings

Figure 3 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kameyama et al. (US 790) in further view of Jones et al. (US 907).

Per claims 1 and 9: See Kameyama at Figure 7. Kameyama does not appear to have an absorption axis of the polarizing element substantially aligned with the polarizer; however, see Jones at Column 8, Lines 47-56. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kameyama in view of Jones for improved contrast ratios as taught in Jones.

Per claims 5 and 6: Kameyama is adaptable to a guest-host device (Col. 15, Lines 15-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2871

to include a polarizer in front of a guest-host LCD for excellent efficiency of light usage as taught in Kameyama.

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kameyama et al. (US 790) and Jones et al. (US 907) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Iijima (US 905).

Per claim 2: Kameyama does not appear to have the elements of claim 2; however, see Iijima (Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kameyama in view of Iijima for a transflective display of dual mode that maximizes light usage as taught in Iijima.

Per claim 4: See Kameyama Figure 7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include polarizers integrated with substrates for a thin display, little absorption loss, and improved luminance (Col. 1, Lines 35-43).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kameyama et al. (US 790) and Jones et al. (US 907) and Iijima (US 905) as applied to claim 2 above and further in view of Umemoto et al. (US 2001/0053029 A1) and Miller (US 378).

Per claim 3: Kameyama does not appear to have the retarder, diffusing element, and polarizer layout as claimed; however, see Umemoto at Figure 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kameyama in view of Umemoto for a transmission type display that is thin, light weight, and that has excellent brightness, uniformity of brightness, and that is easy to view [0002]. Kameyama does not appear to have the slow axes orientations; however, see Miller at Column 1, Lines 20-25 and Lines 56-

Art Unit: 2871

66. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kameyama in view of Miller for a filter of narrow bandpass as taught in Miller.

Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kameyama et al. (US 790) in further view of Matsui (US 048 B1).

Per claims 7 and 10: See Kameyama at Figure 7. Kameyama does not appear to have a display element in front of a backlight and that outputs polarized light; however, see Matsui at Column 7, Lines 63-65 and Column 8, Lines 18-35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kameyama in view of Matsui for a high visibility display especially when incorporated in electronic equipment as taught in Matsui.

Claims 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kataoka et al. (US 111) in further view of Matsui (US 048 B1).

Per claims 8 and 11: See Kataoka at Figures 6A and 6B. Kataoka does not appear to have an absorption axis such that substantially all polarized light outputted from the display is transmitted through the polarizing element; however, see Matsui at Column 7, Lines 63-65 and Column 8, Lines 18-35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kataoka in view of Matsui for a high visibility display especially when incorporated in electronic equipment as taught in Matsui.

Art Unit: 2871

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeanne A. Di Grazio whose telephone number is (703)305-7009. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim, can be reached on (703) 305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-8741 for regular communications and (703)746-8741 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

Jeanne Andrea Di Grazio

Robert Kim, SPE

JDG
May 18, 2003

